



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/939,064	09/29/1997	TERUHISA KAMACHI	SONY-P7815	3506

29175 7590 04/10/2002

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THOMAS T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2002

31

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RJA

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/939,064

Applicant(s)

KAMACHI

Examiner
THOMAS T. NGUYEN

Art Unit
2174



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2002, Request for reconsideration.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

FINAL ACTION

Specification:

An attempt to incorporate subject matter into the patent application by reference to hyperlink and/ or other form of browser-executable code such as URL placed between these symbols "<>" and http:// followed by a URL address is objected and consider to be improper incorporate by reference, see MPEP 608.01(p) paragraph I. Remove those from the specification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 1-2,5-7,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott et al. US Patent 5,621,904 in view of Santos-Gomez US 5,771,042.

As per claim 1,5-6: Elliott discloses a system and method for process and displaying a main information window; and a accompanying information sub-window associated with main information which having a height, a width independent to the main window including automatically arrangement changing the display position moving the sub-window to main window within (less than) a preset predetermined value, and arranging of sub window to a position adjacent to main window (abstract, summary and col.2 , line 40 to col.3, line 30; FIG.2), although Elliott's description of related art discloses user able manually move the sub-window to user specified position (col.1) but Elliott's system does not teach when the user-specified position less than a preset predetermined value the automatically arrangement take place. However, Santos-Gomez discloses a snap region when sub-window is moved to within / less than predetermined distance of the user specified position (Fig.4-5,col.4-5) . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to modify

Elliott's system using Santos's "snap" feature because this gain user control in composition of screen layout and furthermore displaying windows this way are utilizing display spaces effective and efficiently for user viewing without obscured information as suggested by Elliott (col.1-2).

As per claim 2,7,10: Recite from claim 1, Elliott discloses a system for display a sub window adjacent to main window within a preset predetermined value, but Elliott's system discloses automatic arrangement by moves the sub window adjacent to main window and alignment both windows in reserve order (lower side of sub-window with lower side of main window instead upper side see FIG.2,3,4A-B). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention for change sub-window coordinate to alignment the upper sides or lower side of main window and sub window, because organizing the display windows this way it a matter of application preference at the time programming design and in some cases may maximize/ utilize the display area effectively to meet spacing availability and/or user needs.

Claim 3-4,8-9,11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott et al. US Patent 5,621,904 in view of Santos-Gomez US 5,771,042, and further in view of Liles et al. US Patent 5,880,731.

As per claim 3,8,11: Recite from claim 1, but Elliott's image display system does not discloses the main window displays a 3D Virtual Reality and sub windows display a chat perform via an avatar. However, Liles teaches present invention system relates to a virtual space which allows avatar freely move to desired position in a shared in 3D virtual space (abstract, col.3-4, Fig.13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant

art at the time of invention to combine Elliott's position windows display and Liles's disclosures for obtaining an image display which main window in 3D virtual reality space and sub window of a movable chat avatar, because this would enhance system performance and usability.

As per claim 4,9,12: Recite from claim 3, Liles's system describes in virtual world 3D graphic data network communication with the server (col.5-6) but does not disclose any particular language. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to select a well known such as VRML (Virtual Reality Modeling Language) for implement the 3D graphics with avatar in Virtual Reality / Virtual space because this would enhance system performance efficiently / effectively in Virtual Reality environment.

Response to Applicant's Remarks:

Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's remarks but they are not deemed to be persuasive as condition for allowance because the invention is directed toward to arranging two related windows (a main-window and a sub-window) which is known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made for at least within references and reasons cited above. For example, Elliott clearly teaches the related windows are displayed according to applicant's independent claim 1," arranging of sub window to a position adjacent to main window without altering sub window's size including a separated distance between the two windows" (abstract, col.2 line 40 to col.3 line 30; Fig.2-3). In addition, Santos-Gomez discloses a snap region when sub-window is moved to within / less than predetermined distance of the user specified position (Fig.4-5,col.4-5). Regarding the main window and sub windows displayed in a 3-dimensional virtual space Liles', invention teaches a virtual space which allows avatar (object) freely move to

Serial Number: 08/939,064
Art Unit: 2774

5

desired position in a shared 3D virtual space with a plurality of non-overlapped windows (abstract, col.3-4, Fig.13). Since these references are displaying multi-windows concurrently without overlapping as applicant claimed. Therefore, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention was made to assert the user interface task "for user-specified position" using Santos's user interface control for moving a display position of sub window to a user-specified position, with "snap" feature because this gives user composition of screen layout and furthermore displaying windows this way are utilizing display spaces effective and efficiently for user viewing without obscuring information as suggested by Elliott (col.1-2). Other claims contain similar features which are recite from the independent claim and rejected for the same reason (see paper #29).

Conclusion

Accordingly, ***THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.*** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the Patent Examiner **Thomas Nguyen**, whose telephone number is (703) 308-7240 (Monday to Friday 10:30 - 7:00 ET) or *Kristine Kincaid* Supervisory Patent Examiner (703) 308-0640. Other inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900 and Official-Fax number (703) 746-7239 for After Final (703) 746-7238. Please label properly on the cover page of facsimile communications.

Thomas T. Nguyen

04-8-2002



Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100